

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Partent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
PAGE 10, 180, 1450
Alexapdria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.usstot.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/064,892	08/27/2002	Thomas M. Breuel	111744	3616	
27074	7590 08/31/2005		EXAM	EXAMINER	
OLIFF & E	BERRIDGE, PLC.	PAULA, C	PAULA, CESAR B		
P.O. BOX 1 ALEXAND	9928 RIA, VA 22320		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
•	<b>,</b>		2178		
		DATE MAIL ED: 08/31/2005			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	·		
Office Action Summary		10/064,892	BREUEL ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		CESAR B. PAULA	2178			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication apport Reply	pears on the cover sh	eet with the correspondence a	ddress -		
A SH THE F. External Failurents of the Failurents of the Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. a period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailined patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, ly within the statutory minimur will apply and will expire SIX e, cause the application to be	may a reply be timely filed  n of thirty (30) days will be considered time (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this come ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>07 J</u>	<u>une 2005</u> .	•	·		
2a)⊠	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☐ This	s action is non-final.		•		
3)[	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposit	ion of Claims					
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1,3-16 and 18-28 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.  Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) 1,3-16, and 18-28 is/are rejected.  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
Applicati	ion Papers			,		
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objector drawing(s) be held in a tion is required if the dr	beyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). awing(s) is objected to. See 37 C			
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119	·				
a)(	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received ts have been received rity documents have u (PCT Rule 17.2(a))	d. d in Application No been received in this National	l Stage		
Attachmen	t(s)					
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)		rview Summary (PTO-413)			
3) 🔲 Inform	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date		er No(s)/Mail Date ce of Informal Patent Application (PT er:	O-152)		

Art Unit: 2178

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to the amendment filed on 6/7/2005.

This action is made Final.

2. In the amendment, claims 2, and 17 have been canceled. Claims 1, 3-16, and 18-28 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 14, and 16 are independent claims.

#### Oath/Declaration

3. The Oath/Declaration has been submitted. However, the oath or declaration is still defective. A new oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.67(a) identifying this application by application number and filing date is required. See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

The oath or declaration is defective because:

It does not identify the mailing address of each inventor—*Dan Bloomberg*. A mailing address is an address at which an inventor customarily receives his or her mail and may be either a home or business address. The mailing address should include the ZIP Code designation. The mailing address may be provided in an application data sheet or a supplemental oath or declaration. See 37 CFR 1.63(c) and 37 CFR 1.76.

Art Unit: 2178

### **Priority**

4. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(e), and based on U.S provisional application # 60/360,171 filed on 3/1/2002, which papers have been placed of record in the file.

## **Drawings**

5. The drawings filed on 8/27/2002 have been approved by the Examiner.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 7. Claims 1, 3-16, and 18-28 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Formanek et al, hereinafter Formanek (USPub.# 2003/0014445, 1/16/2003, filed 7/13/01, as disclosed in IDS filed on 9/24/03).

Regarding independent claim 1, Formanek discloses decomposing a document image in a format, such as a bitmap format—deconstructing a document in a page image format -- (0029).

Art Unit: 2178

Moreover, Formanek discloses that as a result of the decomposition the document image is divided into image and text blocks—synthesizing the deconstructed document into an intermediate data structure -- (0032, fig. 3b).

Further, Formanek discloses the reflowing of the decomposed document to fit into the size, such as width, of a target device's display—distilling the intermediate data structure for redisplay in a format usable for an arbitrarily sized display structure -- (0030, 0034, fig. 4).

In addition, Formanek discloses that as a result of the decomposition the document image is divided into image and text blocks—identifying text image areas and non-text image areas, and locating and isolating text and non-text image areas. A software identifies the locations, height and width—layout properties—of text and graphic blocks—processing the isolated text image areas and non-text image areas into text line regions and layout properties—(0032, fig. 3b).

Further, Formanek discloses surrounding each word with a bounding graphic block for identifying the location of the word, and graphics—processing located text line regions into segmented image elements; and locating and labeling segmented image elements -- (0032, 0033, fig. 3b-c).

Furthermore, Formanek discloses the compression of the decomposed document elements, such as characters, using character symbols to represent images of characters—token-based image elements (0026).

Art Unit: 2178

Regarding claim 3, which depends on claim 2, Formanek discloses that as a result of the decomposition the document image is divided into image and text blocks—physical segmentation of data -- (0032, fig. 3b).

Regarding claim 4, which depends on claim 1, Formanek discloses that as a result of the decomposition the document image is divided into image and text blocks (0032, fig. 3b).

Regarding claim 5, which depends on claim 1, Formanek discloses that as a result of the decomposition the document image turns into a document divided with image blocks based upon the image location, width and height— converting non-text image areas, Layout properties and segmented image areas into the intermediate data structure— (0032-0033, fig. 3b).

Regarding claim 6, which depends on claim 1, Formanek discloses the reflowing of the decomposed document to fit into the size, such as width, of a target device's display—intelligible display layout -- (0030, 0034, fig. 4).

Regarding claim 7, which depends on claim 6, Formanek discloses that as a result of the decomposition the document image is divided into image and text blocks. The text blocks show segmented word images in a reading order (0032-0033, fig. 3c).

Regarding claim 8, which depends on claim 1, Formanek discloses the storage of the bitmap image blocks in a processing device (0030).

Art Unit: 2178

Regarding claim 9, which depends on claim 1, Formanek discloses the reflowing of the decomposed document to fit into the size, such as width, of a target device's display. The reflowed document is displayed in a readable manner, such as a single format (0030, 0034, fig. 4).

Regarding claim 10, which depends on claim 1, Formanek discloses the reflowing of the decomposed document to fit into the size, such as width, of a target device's display. The document is retrieved over the Internet, reformatted, and displayed—*Internet browsable format* - (0027, 0034, fig. 4).

Regarding claim 11, which depends on claim 1, Formanek discloses the reflowing of the decomposed document to fit into the size, such as width, of a target device's display—device specific display format -- (0027, 0034, fig. 4).

Regarding claim 12, which depends on claim 1, Formanek discloses the *reflowing* of the decomposed document to fit into the size, such as width—screen size --, of a target device's display (0027, 0034, fig. 4).

Regarding claim 13, which depends on claim 1, Formanek discloses the reflowing of the decomposed text in the document to fit into the size, such as width, of a target device's display (0027, 0034, fig. 4).

Art Unit: 2178

Regarding independent claim 14, Formanek discloses identifying block positions of various text, and image regions, and decomposing a document image in a format, such as a pdf format,—analyzing page layout, converting a sequence of page images into a sequence of document elements images captured in a tagged format -- (0029, 0032, fig. 3b).

Furthermore, Formanek discloses the reflowing of the decomposed document to fit into the size, such as width, of a target device's display—re-converting the tagged format. The document is retrieved over the Internet, reformatted, and displayed—Internet browsable format - (0027, 0034, fig. 4).

Regarding claim 15, which depends on claim 14, Formanek discloses that as a result of the decomposition the document image is divided into image and text blocks. The text blocks show segmented word images in a reading order (top to bottom text organization) similar to that of the original document (0032-0033, fig. 3c).

Regarding claim 16, limitations an input/output device.....a distilling circuit...are directed towards a computer system for implementing the steps found in claims 1, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Moreover, Formanek discloses that as a result of the decomposition the document image is divided into image blocks—deconstruct the document into image areas. A bounding block surrounds each word by identifying the location of the word, and graphics-- segmented image

Art Unit: 2178

elements. A software identifies the locations, height and width—layout properties—of text and graphic blocks (0032-0033, fig. 3b).

Moreover, Formanek discloses that as a result of the decomposition the document image turns into a document divided with image blocks—synthesizes the non-text image areas, the layout properties, and the set of segmented image elements into an intermediate data structure -- (0032-0033, fig. 3b):

Furthermore, Formanek discloses the reflowing of the decomposed document to fit into the size, such as width, of a target device's display—distilling the intermediate data structure for redisplay in a format usable for an arbitrarily sized display structure -- (0030, 0034, fig. 4).

Claims 18-20, and 22-27 are directed towards a computer system for implementing the steps found in claims 3, 6-7, and 10-15 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 21, which depends on claim 16, Formanek discloses the storage of the bitmap image blocks—deconstructed document—in a processing device (0030).

Regarding claim 28, which depends on claim 26, Formanek discloses that as a result of the decomposition the document image is divided into image and text blocks—segmentation algorithm --. A software identifies the locations of text and graphic blocks—structure analyzer-(0032, fig. 3b).

Art Unit: 2178

# Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed on 6/7/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claim 1, the Applicants state that Formanek fails to teach or suggest the compressing of segmented image elements into token-based image elements as amended (page 8, parag.1). The Examiner disagrees, because Formanek discloses the compression of the decomposed document elements, such as characters, using character symbols to represent images of characters—token-based image elements (0026).

#### Conclusion

9. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Page 10

Application/Control Number: 10/064,892

Art Unit: 2178

I. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is (571) 272-4128. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong, can be reached on (571) 272-4124. However, in such a case, please allow at least one business day.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, go to <a href="http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair">http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair</a>. Should you have any questions about access to the Private PAIR system, please contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866 217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or faxed to:

• (571)-273-8300 (for all Formal communications intended for entry)

CESAR PAULA PRIMARY EXAMINER

8/5/05